

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/818,788	ABDO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Joseph Manoskey	2113	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) Joseph Manoskey.

 (3) K. Trisha Chang (Reg. No. 48,962).

 (2) Robert Hails (Reg. No. 39,702).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 15 September 2004
**Time:** 11:00 AM
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims discussed:

Claim 33

Prior art documents discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Authorization was given to the Examiner from the Applicant for an Examiner's Amendment to claim 33. The Amendment is to change the limitation "harassing instruction" on the last line of the claim to "harassing transaction".*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)